REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10-12, 14-35, and 38-64 remain pending in this application. Claim 10 has been amended by this paper to depend from currently pending claim 5. Claims 2, 5, 34, 36, 43, 44, and 60 have been amended by this paper. Claims 37-38 were previously canceled. Claims 65-73 are cancelled by this amendment.

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the July 5, 2005 interview with Applicant's Attorney where the amendment submitted on June 6, 2005 was discussed. The Examiner indicated that by maintaining the "sequential basis" limitation to claims 2, 5, 34, 44, and 60, along with the previous amendments based on the June 1, 2005 conversation with Examiner Crawford, that these claims would be allowable. As the June 6, 2005 amendment was not entered, the claims reflect their status prior to the submission of the June 6, 2005 amendment. As such, the "sequential basis" language is not shown in underline, as it was present in the pending claims prior to the June 6, 2005 amendment. Additionally, the remarks regarding the rejections contained in the April 4, 2005 Office Action are also included in this response.

The Applicant acknowledges that claims 1, 3, 4, 16-33, 35 and 45-59 have been allowed by the Examiner. Allowed claims 3 and 21 have been amended herein to correct grammatical errors.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 2, 5, 34, 36-41, 43, 44 and 60-64 are rejected under 35 U.S. C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. RE38,663 issued to Kayani et al ("Kayani"). Kayani teaches a method of semi-continuous currency processing using a currency processing machine. However, several limitations of the pending claims are neither taught nor suggested by Kayani.

Amended independent claim 2 of the pending application requires "receiving source identification information from a separator card for each batch on sequential basis before, or after, evaluating documents in the at least two batches." "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987); MPEP § 2131. Kayani discloses a bar code reader that reads the bar code on a separator card as the separator card is fed through the device. Col. 6, ll. 38-59. Kayani discloses at col. 5, ll. 50-55 that "account data" that would "include the number of individual currency notes, the total currency value, and the identity of the currency stack." Kayani in no way teaches

that any data would be received from a separator card "before, or after, evaluating documents in the at least two batches," as recited in claim 2. Rather, the teaching of Kayani is that a "bar code reader identifies the specific bar code number for each individual separator card" as the separator card is fed by a conveyor through the device. Col. 6, ll. 38-59. Kayani teaches receiving account data information from separator cards during the evaluation of the documents in the batches. *Id.* There is no teaching in Kayani that source information, or any other "account data" is entered from a separator card before evaluating documents in the batches or after evaluating documents in the batches. Thus, for at least this reason, Kayani fails to teach, disclose, or suggest all of the limitations of claim 2. Therefore, Kayani does not anticipate or render obvious claim 2, and Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 5 requires "entering into memory of a document processing device source identification information from a separator card for the at least two batches in a sequence" and "after entering the source identification information for the at least two batches into memory, begin transporting the batches in a sequence consistent with the sequence in which the source identification information was entered into memory, one document at a time, through the document processing device to obtain characteristic information from the documents in the at least two batches." As previously stated, Kayani teaches receiving account data information from separator cards during the evaluation of the documents in the batches. Col. 6, ll. 38-59. Therefore, Kayani does not teach or suggest at least these limitations of claim 5, and does not anticipate and render obvious claim 5.

Amended independent claim 34 of the current application recites "storing in memory a first source identification information associated with a first batch of documents from a first separator card," "storing in memory a second source identification information associated with a second batch of documents from a second separator card," and "after the acts of storing the first and second source identification information in memory, transporting the first and second batches, one document at a time, past at least one detector to obtain characteristic information from the documents." As previously stated, Kayani in no way teaches or suggests this limitation.

Amended independent claim 36 recites "a data entry interface for entering into memory the source identification information from a separator card for each of the at least two batches," and "wherein the source identification information for each of the at least two batches is stored in the memory before the batch document information for each batch is stored, and the

programming for matching comprises programming for sequentially stepping through the source identification information for each of the at least two batches." Kayani in no way teaches or suggests such a limitation, therefore, claim 36 is allowable over Kayani.

Independent claim 43 recites "a data entry interface for entering into memory the source identification information from a respective separator card for each of the at least two batches," and "storing the source identification information received from the data entry interface for each of the at least two batches into memory before transporting the at least two batches past the evaluation unit." Kayani only discloses receiving data from the separator cards during the evaluation of all of the documents in the batches. Col. 6, ll. 38-59. Therefore, claim 43 is allowable over Kayani.

Amended independent claim 44 recites "a data entry interface for entering into memory the source identification information from a respective separator card for each of the at least two batches," "memory coupled to the evaluation unit being adapted to store batch document information for each of the at least two batches based on evaluating the documents and being adapted to store source identification information received from the data entry interface for each of the at least two batches," and "a controller adapted to store the batch document information for each of the at least two batches into memory before the source identification information for each of the at least two batches." As previously stated, Kayani in no way teaches or suggests such a limitations, but instead only obtains data from the separator cards during the evaluation of all documents of the batch. Col. 6, ll. 38-59. Thus, Kayani does not anticipate or render obvious claim 44.

Amended independent claim 60 recites "receiving into memory of a document processing device source identification information from a respective separator card for at least two batches of documents in a sequence," and "after the act of receiving the source identification information for the at least two batches into memory, begin transporting the batches in a sequence consistent with the sequence in which the source identification information was received into memory, one document at a time, through the document processing device to obtain characteristic information from the documents in the at least two batches." As previously stated, Kayani in no way teaches or suggests such limitations. Thus, Kayani does not anticipate or render obvious claim 60.

Claims 6-8, 12, 14, 15, 39-42, and 61-64 are dependent claims that depend from at least one of the independent claims previously discussed. As none of the independent claims are

anticipated or rendered obvious by Kayani for the reasons given above, the dependent claims are allowable for at least those same reasons.

Conclusion

It is Applicants' belief that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance, and action towards that effect is respectfully requested. A check is enclosed in the amount of $120 to cover the cost of a one month extension. Should any additional fees be required (except for payment of the issue fee), the Commissioner is authorized to deduct the fees from Jenkens & Gilchrist, P.C. Deposit Account No. 10-0447, Order No. 47171-00400USPT.

If there are any matters which may be resolved or clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the number indicated.

Dated: August 3, 2005   Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Mark R. Anderson
    Registration No.: 54,656
JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
    CORPORATION
225 W. Washington, Ste. 2600
Chicago, Illinois 60606-3418
(312) 425-3900
Attorneys For Applicant

CHICAGO 313525v1 47171-00400USPT